

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on August 9, 2007, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 1, 11, and 14 have been amended and claims 10, 12, 13, and 20 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Easy Microsoft Word 2003 by Heidi Steele (published September 19, 2003, hereinafter “Steele”) in view of Michaelides (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0181753 (filed March 10, 2003), hereinafter “Michaelides”).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-20 are rejected as being unpatentable over Steele in view of Michaelides. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 specifies a method of formatting a selection of text from a document as an Extensible Markup Language (XML) formatted selection such that the selection of text carries formatting properties particular to the selection of text for use in an other document. The method includes selecting the selection of text in the document; identifying an XML markup specifying one or more formatting properties associated with the selection of text; applying the XML markup to the selection of text; associating the XML markup with the selection of text for designating that the selection of text is formatted according to the XML markup independent of an other XML markup associated with the other document into which the selection of text is inserted; avoiding a conflict between the XML markup associated with the selection of text and the other XML markup associated with the other document by causing the XML markup associated with the selection of text to be carried with the selection of text when the selection of text is inserted into the other document to maintain the application of the XML markup data to

the selection of text in the other document independent of the other XML markup associated with the other document; and providing a framework for an annotation of the XML markup by associating the selection of text with at least one XML schema file for providing a definition of the XML markup applied to the selection of text and for providing XML parsing application rules for understanding and using the XML tag.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Steele and Michaelides fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 1. For example, the aforementioned combination fails to disclose providing a framework for an annotation of the XML markup by associating the selection of text with at least one XML schema file for providing a definition of the XML markup applied to the selection of text and for providing XML parsing application rules for understanding and using the XML tag.

In contrast to claim 1 and as stated by the Office Action, Steele fails to disclose XML documents and therefore cannot disclose providing a framework for an annotation of an XML markup. In addition, Michaelides fails to overcome Steele's deficiencies. For example, Michaelides merely discloses a software adapter controlled by metadata. The Office Action indicates Michaelides discloses an XML schema in its Appendix. Applicants respectfully disagree. Michaelides' Appendix merely discloses a source XML template. See Appendix. In Michaelides, the Appendix is merely a listing of source code. Consequently, Michaelides fails to teach or disclose providing a framework for an annotation of an XML markup. Thus, based on the foregoing, amended claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Steele and Michaelides and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-9 depend from amended claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 11 specifies similar features as amended claim 1 and thus is allowable over the combination of Steele and Michaelides for at least the same reasons. Based on the foregoing, the combination of Steele and Michaelides fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claim 11. Therefore, claim 11 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be also withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 14 specifies similar features as amended claim 1 and thus is allowable over the combination of Steele and Michaelides for at least the same reasons. Based on the foregoing, the combination of Steele and Michaelides fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claim 14. Therefore, claim 14 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be also withdrawn.

Claims 15-19 depend from amended claim 14, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5064

Date: February 11, 2008

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III
Reg. No. 47,299

27488

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE